

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/693,183	10/24/2003	Paul A. Knight	KT-0301	9490	
7590 07/29/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER	
KnuBox Technologies 4127 South Hatch Street			DOUGLAS, STEVEN O		
Spokane, WA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3751		

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/693,183	KNIGHT ET AL.	\\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	l in		
	Steven O. Douglas	3751			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	he correspondence ac	ddress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replace of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply oly within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS e. cause the application to become ABANI	be timely filed 0) days will be considered time 6 from the mailing date of this of	ely. communication.		
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 (October 2003.				
•	s action is non-final.				
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examination of the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the correction o	ewn from consideration. For election requirement. The recepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance ction is required if the drawing(s)	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 C			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Appority documents have been re au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this Nationa	al Stage		
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/06) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07152004.		Mail Date rmal Patent Application (P	TO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/693,183

Art Unit: 3751

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4,6-10,12-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kerssies'364.

The Kerssies reference discloses a fuel dispensing nozzle with a spout 2 having first inside and a second outside surface, but does not disclose either the first or second surfaces being made of a material having a surface energy less than aluminum (i.e. a surface energy less than 30 dynes per centimeter). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make either one of the surfaces, as well as both surfaces, of a material having a surface energy less than 30 dynes per centimeter (i.e. such a material can be a fluoropolymer which is well known and has inherent electrical insulation properties), since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

In regard to claims 13-18 and 20, the method as claimed would be inherent during the normal use and manufacturing of the resulting device.

Application/Control Number: 10/693,183

Art Unit: 3751

Claims 1,2,5,6,7,8,11,12,13 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slattery.

The Slattery reference discloses a fuel dispensing nozzle with a spout 4 having first inside and a second outside surface with associated ribs associated with collar 29, but does not disclose either the first or second surfaces being made of a material having a surface energy less than aluminum (i.e. a surface energy less than 30 dynes per centimeter). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make either one of the surfaces, as well as both surfaces, of a material having a surface energy less than 30 dynes per centimeter (i.e. such a material can be a fluoropolymer which is well known and has inherent electrical insulation properties), since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416*.

In regard to claims 13 and 16-20, the method as claimed would be inherent during the normal use and manufacturing of the resulting device.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Foster reference pertains to a fuel hose with associated insulating surfaces.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven O. Douglas whose telephone number is 703-308-0891. The examiner can normally be reached on Wed-Fri 6:30-7:00.

Application/Control Number: 10/693,183

Art Unit: 3751

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Steven Ö. Douglas Primary Examiner Art Unit 3751

SD 7-28-04